

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-4, 11-14 and 23-25 are now present in the application. Claims 1-3, 11 and 13 have been amended. Claims 23-25 have been added. Claims 5-10 and 15-22 have been withdrawn and hereby cancelled. Claims 1, 11 and 23-25 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Interview With The Examiner

An interview was conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application on September 19, 2005. Applicants appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the telephone interview.

In the interview with the Examiner, Applicants' representative presented arguments with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Specifically, it was argued that Cheng fails to teach the features of shorting-circuiting the ESD protection devices. The Examiner stated his position regarding how he interpreted the term "shorting-circuiting" of claims 1 and 11 in view of Cheng's jump line 20. Applicants' representative and the Examiner also discussed possible claim amendments. However, no agreement has been reached on this issue.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is improper and should immediately be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the finality of the Final Office Action mailed on June 22, 2005 should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner persists in maintaining his rejections, Applicants submit that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants are responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments as they remove issues for appeal.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 3 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, independent claims 23 and 24 have been added to include the allowable subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 13, respectively, as discussed hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0063574 A1, now U.S. Patent No. 6,720,791 (referred to hereinafter as Cheng). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Independent claim 1 now recites a combination of steps including "short-circuiting each of at least one of the ESD protection devices separately to form a current path on the corresponding one of the signal wirings".

Independent claim 11 now recites a combination of elements including "a conductive shorting bar to short-circuit each of at least one of the ESD protection devices separately".

Support for the above combinations of steps and elements can be found on FIG. 4 and paragraphs 057 and 058. Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of steps and elements set forth in claims 1 and 11 are not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Cheng teaches an LCD testing method by grouping two signal lines with a jump line 20 to detect whether the feedback signal from the signal-line group falls within a predetermined range (see FIG. 2; col. 3, lines 16-26). Cheng's jump line 20 is used to *connect* two ESD protection devices on the second ends 2 of two signal lines 10 (see FIG. 2). The Examiner characterizes this feature as short-circuiting the two ESD protection devices. However, in Applicants' invention, the conductive bar is used to short-circuit each of the ESD protection devices separately, i.e., each ESD protection device within itself alone is short-circuited independent of the other ESD protection devices. In clear contrast, Cheng's connection (referred

to by the Examiner as “short-circuiting”) is applicable to within at least two (2) ESD protection devices.

Therefore, Cheng fails to teach “short-circuiting each of at least one of the ESD protection devices separately to form a current path on the corresponding one of the signal wirings” as recited in amended claim 1 and “a conductive shorting bar to short-circuit each of at least one of the ESD protection devices separately” as recited in amended claim 11.

Since Cheng fails to teach at least the above-noted features of amended independent claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 11 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over Cheng. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 23-25 have been added for the Examiner’s consideration.

As mentioned, new independent claims 23 and 24 have been added to include all of the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 11 and the allowable subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 13, respectively. Accordingly, claims 23 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 25 is directed to the elected species. Support for new claim 25 can be found on FIG. 4 and paragraphs 057 and 058. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 25 is not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 23 and 24 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$120.00 is attached herewith.

Application No.: 10/665,576
Art Unit: 2829

Attorney Docket No. 2658-0311P
Amendment due October 22, 2005
Page 11 of 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/GH/mmi/cl

GR

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000